DEMOCRACY IN AFRICA: COLONIZATION VS. MODERNIZATION

BY

ANDREW GOGGANS

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Global and International Studies and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Chairperson Dr. M. Wuthrich

_____

Dr. B. Baumann

_____

Dr. J. Kennedy

Date Defended: June 23, 2016

The Thesis Committee for Andrew Goggans
certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:

DEMOCRACY IN AFRICA: COLONIZATION VS. MODERNIZATION

_____
Chairperson, Dr. M. Wuthrich

Date approved: June 23, 2016

Abstract

A country's degree of democratic development is the best predictor of economic prosperity. African nations are some of the poorest on the planet and tend to have low levels of democracy, while wealthier nations tend toward higher levels. If Africa is going to increase its economic output, theory suggests one of the best ways to accomplish such a goal is to increase African democracy levels. Why do some countries in Africa develop democracy while others do not? I analyze the Freedom House and Polity IV democracy scores for each country in order to determine which countries are the most democratic and compare them with historical and demographic data, such as political instability events, fragmentation, population, GDP, and colonial history, in order to give a more robust picture of what factors matter most in the development of democracy in Africa. I also analyze data on countries outside of Africa in order to determine whether or not Africa has different prerequisites for democracy than the rest of the world. I theorize literacy rates, urbanization, and elimination of fragmentation may be more important than economic factors in the development of democracy in Africa.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Which country, since independence, has had one of the fastest growing Gross Domestic Products in the world, experienced continuous democratic rule, had free and fair elections, responsive state institutions with low corruption levels, and levels of human development ranking among the highest in the world? The island nation of Mauritius has all of these qualities and more. A bastion of democracy, Mauritius has been a shining example of development since gaining independence in 1968. Although one of the most successful, Mauritius is not the only African country to boast such accomplishments. Other nations like Cape Verde and Sao Tome and Principe have experienced similar tracks toward freedom and prosperity. Others, such as The Gambia and Gabon have not been able to transition toward true freedom, despite sharing certain characteristics with Mauritius. Why have some states in Africa been able to establish successful democratic governance, while such a feat has escaped the majority of African countries for decades? I examine this question by analyzing how political instability, fragmentation, economic measures, modernization and colonization influence the development of democracy in both Africa and the rest of the world.

The continent of Africa is home to only a few true democratic regimes. Most are either democratic in name only, or are unquestionably authoritarian. Freedom House, an independent organization dedicated to the expansion of freedom and democracy in the world, currently classifies forty percent of the world as "Free countries," with twenty-four percent being partially free, and thirty-six percent "Not Free" (Freedom House, 2015). In Africa, the numbers are even worse. Only ten countries out of fifty-three are classified as "Free," a rate of only nineteen percent. In order to receive "Partly Free" or "Not Free" ratings, countries may experience limited free or fair elections, choice of political parties, little to no minority representation, high levels of political corruption, very few civil rights, civil war and limited or non-existent freedom of the

press. Without access to these, a country cannot rightly be classified as a democracy, and may be only considered to be "partly free." Very few of the countries in Africa can boast access to such rights.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) grants civil liberties to everyone in the world. According to the declaration, democracy is the best avenue available to ensure access to civil rights (United Nations, 2016) . Democratic values are universal because of the intrinsic value of political participation, the way democracy keeps governments accountable through political incentives, and the way democracy helps citizens understand their needs, rights and duties (Sen, 1999). Overwhelmingly, citizens of the world prefer democracy to any other system of government (Shin, 2012). If Africa were to be fully democratic, millions of people would finally gain access to the political and civil liberties granted by the UDHR. In order for access to happen, we must first understand what factors are the most influential in transitions to democracy.

Democracy's ability to bring equality to disparate groups of people is one of its strongest features. The people of Mauritius found a novel way to equalize representation: *consociationalism* (Srebrenik, 2012), an idea guaranteeing minority groups have representation in the government. Mauritius has twenty three-seat constituencies, half in rural areas populated by the Hindu, who make up a little over half of the ethnicity of the island, and half in the urban areas, where everyone else lives. Prior to the election, each candidate must register as a member of one of the four officially recognized ethnicities: Hindu, Muslim, Sino-Mauritian, or General Population. The three candidates in each constituency with the highest vote totals are elected, with up to eight seats awarded to the party whose candidates lost their elections. Following the election, any ethnic group with a representation level below the actual percentage of population level is awarded seats to correct the imbalance. Consociationalism assures each group has

representation equal to its constituency. The many ethnic groups in Africa may attain equal voice in a democracy through consociationalism.

Democracy also enables beneficial economic reform. Many countries rely on foreign aid because of an inability to legitimately collect taxes. A state relying too much on international aid is less accountable to its citizens because the state does not depend on tax revenue (Moss, 2006). For instance, both Mauritania and Rwanda have an incredibly high percentage of government revenue coming from overseas development aid, at eighty-seven and ninety-nine percent, respectively (Bräutigam, 2004). Mauritania and Rwanda are freer to act without any regard toward the will of the people. Each state is less willing to invest in beneficial programs or institutions benefiting the people. By instituting democratic economic reforms, states will lessen corruption caused by an over-reliance on foreign aid through the legitimate collection of taxes. Additionally, economic reforms can provide transparence, ensuring confident, legitimate investment into the needful but resource-rich environments of Africa.

Democracy provides accountability for elected officials and the court systems through free and fair elections. In order for a government to be taken seriously by the governed, there can be no doubt the government is providing citizens access to basic civil rights. Accountability works to check the power of governments by removing from the decision-making process corrupt or incompetent officials. By establishing a clear record of votes and economic transactions, governments encourage public participation in the democratic process. Governments lacking accountability engender apathy in a citizenry struggling with the fundamental question of what difference each citizen can make. When African countries enable democratic reforms, citizens will be gaining access to true freedom.

Much of the current literature focuses on how economic development impacts whether or not a country is democratic. Some scholars theorize a country's prospering economy and thriving

citizenry will demand freedom. Seymour Lipset posits development and modernization work hand-in-hand to increase incomes and, therefore, social change (Lipset, 1959). A more modern theory holds the relationship between income and the development of democratic institutions is non-linear (Dervis, 2006). Even though determining causality in whether good economies develop democracies or democracies develop good economies may be impossible, a positive correlation exists between the two (Acemoglu, 2009). Because of the abundance of theories relating economics to the development of democracy, economic measure were included in my analysis. If economics turn out to be insignificant factors, something more institutional in nature may be more important.

Democratic development may be dependent upon balancing the power of different classes with each other and with the government. Demographic changes, such as the size of the middle and working class, and also whether or not the government works to protect the rights of these classes, reflect power balance. A growing middle class reflects a positive change in power balance, as the number of poorer citizens decreases without a corresponding increase in wealth transfer to the elites. One way to protect the rights of the non-elites is to grant property rights to individuals, which enables capitalist development (Roxas, 2011). Property rights make political exclusion of the middle and working classes difficult for governments (Huber, 1993). Property rights make stakeholders out of individuals, which may increase the development of democracy.

Other theories on democratic development focus on geography and demographics. There is an apparent correlation between size and democratization. The smaller a country's population, the more likely the government is to be democratic (Dahl, 1973). Other arguments say population is not the determining factor, but total geographic area is the most important (Anckar, 2008). Narrowing the focus, Anckar found islands are the most likely to be democratic, possibly due to both geographical area and population (Anckar, 2006). If demographic factors are the

most important, the outlook for democratic development is dim, due to demographic factors largely lying beyond the control of governments and populations.

I examine the process by which countries in Africa develop democracy via mixed method quantitative analysis and qualitative case study. I evaluate the evolution of democracy in three main ways. The first way is by looking at "big picture" puzzles, such as why structures or patterns happened in one place, but not another. Second, my analytical perspective takes temporal arguments into account. When looking at why institutions did or did not develop in certain places, one must account for historical differences -- in the particular case of Africa, the colonial heritage of different European powers and each power's effect on developing the habits and physical institutional structures central to democratic development. Finally, my approach looks at the context of each factor. I weigh the relative importance of each against external factors, rather than simply identifying one cause and applying it in all cases regardless of circumstance. This approach uses broad and multi-factored analysis, and so makes an ideal way through which one may analyze the problem of African democratic development. As the goal of my paper is to examine multiple factors contributing to African democratic development, mixed method analysis allows me to look at the big picture patterns of development, both in Africa and the rest of the world, with not just descriptive analysis, but also prescriptive solutions for current African non-democracies.

What is the primary reason some countries in Africa have developed democracy while others have not? Are these reasons different for Africa than for other countries of the world? To find out, I ran a regression analysis for the Freedom House and Polity IV measures of democracy against several variables: Years a country experienced political instability, number of political instability events, French and British colonial history, population, landlocked status, GDP per capita, GINI, degree of urbanization, ethnic, linguistic and religious fragmentation, and adult

literacy rate. I then compared the results of the regression analysis with the real-world results from the African nations of Mauritius and Gabon. My results indicate Africa's needs for democracy are different from the rest of the world. But, the analysis of my case studies shows numbers may not tell the whole story, as the case of Mauritius illustrates. In most countries, events that cause political instability contribute negatively toward the development of democracy. However, Africa appears to be different. Economic, literacy and colonization variables may not contribute as much to democracy as current literature suggests. My research indicates urbanization and income inequality do remain significant factors for non-African countries. These results show significant changes must be made in the attitudes of developed countries toward Africa in regard to the development of democracy on the continent.

Literature Review

Theories on Democratic Development

There have been many theories on how countries begin the process of democratization and maintain democracy. The most influential theory is modernization, which postulates societies are more likely to be democratic as countries grow more prosperous and develop civic institutions. Income inequality, measured by GINI, may also play a role in democratization. Research shows colonial history and geography may also be significant predictors of democratic robustness. If a country was democratic in the past, it is more likely to develop or retain democracy. Regional differences also matter. Countries in regions where democracy is present tend toward democracy, while countries in "bad neighborhoods" tend not to be. Literacy rates, ethnic fragmentation and political instability events may also be significant factors in whether or not countries transition to democracy. There has not been a sufficient amount of research linking the previously outlined causal factors together to in order to determine which are the most influential. I will provide an overview of each factor showing why each was chosen for inclusion in my analysis.

I. Political Instability Events

Political instability events can take many forms, from military coups to civil wars to authoritarian reversals. Their role in destabilizing the infrastructure and institutions of democracy in African countries cannot be overstated. Political instability events are numerous and effective due to the relative ease of exploiting existing internal conflict. Internal conflict creates pockets of non-democratic politics, which is easier than trying to impose external power upon a society (Nyong'o, 1988). Both political stability and instability tend to be self-reinforcing (Feng, 1997). Democracies tend to engage in fewer military disputes across nations because of the way

disputes tend to create an unstable chain of events (Maoz and Russet, 1992). Thus, a country wishing to transition to democracy must stop unstable events.

Democracy is also positively correlated with major *regular* government change (change governed by law and order) and reduces the probability of *irregular* government change (Feng, 1997). Feng found the probability of a *coup d'etat* was lower when the rate of economic growth was high (1997). High economic growth was positively correlated with a stable democratic political system (1997). Interestingly, many democratic transitions occur in middle-income countries (per capita $2,346 - $5,000 US 1980), as traditional autocratic regimes find it difficult to maintain their power amidst an increasingly complex society (Haggard, 1995). There is, however, a problem confounding democracy with stability because democracy can be measured on a continuum rather than an either-or (Bollen and Jackman, 1989). The role of political instability events in undermining democratic development appears to be important, but its relative significance in African countries and non-African countries is unknown. Political instability events may merely be a symptom of dysfunction elsewhere in the African political system.

Hypothesis 1: High levels of political instability will be significantly correlated with low levels of democracy.

II. Modernization Theory

Modernization theory posits as a country's economy prospers and grows richer, citizens will begin to demand freedom in the form of democracy. Belonging to Seymour Lipset, modernization theory is perhaps the most often-cited theory on the development of democracy (Lipset, 1959). In Lipset's theory, development and modernization work to increase incomes by providing a healthy environment in which economies may prosper. Positive economic outcomes, in turn, cause social change. Modernization theory can be supported in part with current data

from the World Bank showing countries rated highest in democratic freedom (Freedom House, 2016) have, in general, higher GDP per capita than countries classified as "Not Free" (World Bank, 2016). As incomes increase from $1,000 toward $5,001-$6,000 PPP, countries are more likely to be democracies (Prezeworksi, 1995). World Bank data shows a correlation between economic development and democracy. But not all data supports Lipset's conclusion.

IIA. Socioeconomic Modernization

More recent theory holds the relationship between income and the development of democratic institutions is neither simple nor linear, in contrast to early modernization theory. Neither extreme poverty and underdevelopment nor more extensive economic prosperity provide fertile ground for blooming democracy. Countries with incomes below $1,000 PPP and countries above $6,000 PPP are more likely to be authoritarian regimes (Przeworski, 1997). This creates a "bell-shaped pattern of instability," with democracy prevalent in the middle, flanked by authoritarian regimes (Huntington, 1968). Additionally, there is not a significant difference in economic growth between democratic and authoritarian regimes (Dervis, 2006). In one study, democracy was, indeed, positively correlated with economic growth, but the effect was statistically insignificant (Feng, 1997). Statistical insignificance means conclusions drawn about the effect of economic growth on democracy are tenuous, at best, and not supported in full by data. Because there are poor countries who have developed relatively high levels of democratic institutions and many countries with relatively high levels of per capita income lagging far behind in measures of democracy, one cannot assume a linear progression model will lead any country toward democracy via an established path.

On the other hand, there is evidence supporting the position economic development has a positive correlation with democratic transition. In some studies, there is not only correlation, but causation, as well. Democratic development increases income equality and decreases the amount

of money the rich would lose to an autocratic regime (Boix and Stokes, 2003). Democracy outpaces dictatorships in economic growth at all income levels save for the lowest (Milanovic, 2005). Higher levels of per capita income consolidate existing democracies and promote transitions from authoritarian to democratic regimes (Epstein, et. al, 2006; Rueschemeyer, 1992). "Strong evidence supports the argument that economic development increases the likelihood of democratic politics (Geddes, 1999)." These studies show a direct relationship between economic growth and democracy, in contrast to the previously outlined studies. The differing outcomes show democratic development remains far more nuanced and complex.

One such nuance is the effect class power has upon democracy. Some theories suggest the equalization of class power, or at least the lessening of a large discrepancy in power between the classes, is a key factor for democracies. The first reason is a sufficient class balance does not allow one group to be powerful enough to singularly dominate the state (Bardhan, 1993). Traditionally, the landed upper classes were the biggest opponents of democracy (Huber, et. al., 1993). Second, equalization of class power positively impacts the outcomes of bargaining between employers and unions or the working class (Huber, et. al., 1997), providing them with more power relative to the upper class. Class balance is a central factor in the ability for lower classes to affect policy, and may also contribute to a rebalancing of income inequality, which will be discussed shortly.

Hypothesis 2: Higher levels of GDP will be significantly correlated with higher levels of democracy.

IIB. Cultural Modernization

The second facet of Lipset's modernization theory concerns what impact institutions and cultural indoctrination have on democracy (1959). Institutions and culture work together to increase the legitimacy of democratic institutions by providing structure and accountability to

governments. Workers' organizations, trade unions and political parties are some of the institutions playing a major role in extending democracy (Lipset, 1959). For instance, legitimacy allowed Norwegian democracy to remain stable, even when the economy was not very prosperous (Eckstein, 1966). Institutions have been historically underdeveloped in Africa, especially post-independence, when the rise of single-party systems remained unresponsive to the demands of varied ethnic groups (Brautigam, 2004). However, as Arat found, democracy and the development of social structures do not necessarily increase together in lock-step (Arat, 1988). Because of the conflicting nature of the findings of various scholars, more research is needed in this area.

Hypothesis 3: Higher levels of urbanization will be correlated with greater scores for democracy.

III. Inequality Theory

Several scholars have identified low levels of income inequality as a key determinant of democratic development. But how, exactly, income equality exerts influence on democracy is not entirely clear. Economic equality has been shown to both increase the probability of democratic transition and stability of the regimes (Boix, 2003). High levels of income inequality are correlated with declines in levels of democracy (Acemoglu, 2001; Muller, 1995). Similarly, high levels of democratic participation are correlated with lower levels of income inequality (Mueller, 2002, Li, 2003). However, income equality comes with a corresponding cost. High participation is also correlated with larger government entities, leading to a slowing of economic growth (Mueller, 2002). In fact, most of the time, income inequality is positively associated with economic growth (Li, 1998). Positive association between income inequality and economic growth is in conflict with Lipset's theory of economic development, where he posits economic growth among all classes is a key driver of democracy. There is room in Lipset's theory for

income inequality, for it does not specify that income growth must be the same across classes. But, more refinement to the theory is needed.

Hypothesis 4: Lower levels of inequality will be correlated with higher levels of democracy.

III. Country Size

Size does appear to play a role in the development of democracy of states, but how big that role is is up for debate. In this case, size does not refer just to geographical size, but also to population density. Geographical size is negatively correlated with democracy. Small, insular nations are most strongly connected to democratic development (Anckar, 1995). Specifically, small island states are more likely to be democratic, regardless of level of economic development (Srebrnik, 2004). Total geographical area may also be an important variable, not just whether or not the country is an island (Anckar, 2008). Larger population size encourages democracy through a more developed political infrastructure and a greater dispersal of power (Gerring, 2011). Anckar theorizes the homogeneity of small, insular societies contributes more to democracy than absolute size (2002). Homogeneity contradicts the idea of size as the determining factor. Although size arguments are usually applied to micro-states and island nations, they do have implications for larger states, as geographical size and homogeneity are largely beyond the control of governments.

Hypothesis 5: Population will be positively correlated with scores for democracy.

IV. Fragmentation

There are over 50 countries in Africa, and an even greater number of individual ethnic groupings. Virtually none of these countries' borders were drawn with any respect to differing ethnicities, resulting in high ethnic fragmentation among African countries. Some theorize ethnic fragmentation has a negative effect on democracy. For instance, in the United States, ethnic

fragmentation is negatively correlated with the provision of public goods and infrastructure (Alesina, 1997). Easterly and Levine found high ethnic fragmentation explains insufficient infrastructure, high government deficits and political instability (1997). High ethnic fragmentation can help democracy if no single group has all the power (Reilly, 2000). When the different ethnic groups are not strong enough to individually propel a candidate to office, there is a resulting need for differing groups to collaborate and compromise on nominating candidates with a broader appeal (Mozaffar, 2003). But, the effects of power sharing between ethnic groups is unclear, having failed in places like Rwanda and Angola, and been successful in South Africa and Somaliland (Alesina, 2004). That linguistic diversity has a greater stabilization effect on new democracies than racial or religious fragmentation could be of special importance in a place like Africa, where linguistic diversity is high (Birnir, 2007). Additionally, some scholars have shown ethnic diversity not contribute to insurgency or civil war (Fearon, 2003). The effect of all forms of fragmentation on democracy is unclear. My research seeks to provide a measure of the impact fragmentation has on democratic development.

Hypothesis 6: Higher levels of ethnic and linguistic fragmentation will be correlated with lower levels of democracy.

Hypothesis 7: Higher levels of religious fragmentation will be correlated with lower levels of democracy.

V. Literacy

Though new forms of media change the way we learn and interact with political systems, a basic literacy is needed in order to understand how democracy functions and how democracy can benefit the individual. Understanding the issues facing emerging democracies cannot be truly accomplished without literacy and education. Literacy enables a form of citizenship in which advantaged and disadvantaged groups have the opportunity to shape their lives in ways that

benefit them, instead of being the subject of oppression by ruling elites (Giroux, 1992). Healthy democracy requires extended learning and deliberation, and one place this type of learning exists is in the classroom. Traditional classroom-based civic education can, and does, increase political knowledge (Galston, 2001). The process of debate and deliberation helps citizens see the benefit of democracy and make it relevant in their own lives (Jacobs, 2009). Technology has always both facilitated and been an impediment to democracy, hindering the illiterates' understanding of the issues when print was the only medium through which information was readily disseminated and helping the illiterate when new forms of communication independent of literacy, such as direct voice communication, arose (Williams, 2009). The emerging citizenry needs to be literate in all forms of new media in order to be an engaged and active participatory democracy (Mihailidis, 2013). Citizens' literacy increases knowledge of the issues, allowing them to make informed decisions about the future. Informed citizens may be a significant factor in the development of democracy.

Hypothesis 8: Higher rates of adult literacy will be significantly correlated with higher levels of democracy.

VI. The Legacy of Colonialism

Colonialism, the practice of acquiring control over another country, is one of the non-economic factors current literature identifies as a significant predictor of democratic development. Scholars posit colonial heritage plays a large part in the eventual development of democracy. If an occupying colonial power was democratic, it may have left behind behaviors or institutions the citizens assimilated into current democracies (Anckar, 2002; Clague, et. al, 2001; Bernhard 2004). Democracy is a process of accommodation, requiring different parties to voluntarily divide and coalesce. Parties must agree a singular vision is not always possible (Rustow, 1970). Attitudes toward democracy and democratic ideals are not easily changed. By

providing structural authorities in society, such as family, church, business and trade unions, democracy may be normalized into a culture (Eckstein, 1997). Normalization shows people how democracy works, rather than simply telling citizens it does and expecting people to choose democracy without proof of efficacy. But, normalization only shows *how* colonialism influences democracy. The question of whether or not colonialism is a significant factor in democratic development remains unanswered.

There have been quite a number of studies examining the impact of colonial history on modern day countries. Studies have examined the issue in a number of different ways, mostly examining the impacts of past colonialism on current economies. Colonialism contributes to current-day income inequality, a factor linked with democracy, when European settlers are the minority group in a country (Angeles, 2006). However, the effect of colonialism on economic growth is insignificant (Milanovic, 2005). Furthermore, countries with colonial histories experienced high levels of external extraction (whether through the slave trade or natural resources) and still suffer the effects of extraction today. Extraction causes former colonies to exhibit low levels of development (Nunn, 2007). A few studies show colonial heritage is positively associated with democratic survival; British colonial heritage, specifically, is more influential in democratic development than other colonials powers (Bernhard, et. al, 2004; Lange, 2004; Clague, 2001; Olsson, 2009). However, if colonial rule was initiated during the Imperial era (around 1850), there was not enough time for the colonies to be fully indoctrinated with democratic ideals, and so these countries still have relatively low levels of democracy (Olsson, 2009). African countries may have been colonized too recently for colonialism to have made any significant impact on current-day democratic status.

Hypothesis 9: British colonial history will be positively correlated with democracy, while French colonial history will have a negative correlation.

Summary

Current literature identifies many factors with influence over democratic development. However, no single factor has emerged through literature as being the most influential. Most importantly, these variables have not been evaluated against one another in order to determine which are the most important. The goal of my research is to weigh the available theories against one another through statistical analysis. My method will show how competing arguments may be numerically compared and evaluated.

Methods

The goal of my research is to determine the factors contributing the most toward democratic development in Africa. In order to do this, I chose to compare regression analyses on all the countries in Africa to regression analyses on all the countries of the world. The first analysis determined the factors most important to democracy in current-day Africa. The second analysis sought to determine if the factors for Africa are different than the factors important to non-African countries. Each variable is an analogue for a specific theory on democratic transition. I expected to find economic prosperity is the most influential factor in democratic development, as the bulk of research has previously identified economic outcomes as being the most important.

Key variables

My dependent variables were direct and indirect measures of democracy. Two ranking systems stood out as the most widely recognized and thorough: Freedom House and Polity IV. Though Freedom House does not directly measure democracy, Freedom House scores correlate with Polity IV's more direct measure of democracy. Freedom House has three broad classification categories, Not Free, Partly Free and Free. A value of "1" means society is the most free, while "7" indicates it is the least free. Polity IV, on the other hand, measures democracy on a sliding scale from -10 (the least free) to 10 (the most free). I used both systems on separate analyses in order to make sure any conclusions were more easily generalizable to democracy, as opposed to one ranking system over another. Both Freedom House and Polity IV provide scores from their websites.

Three variables provide measurable values for the key ideas of socioeconomic modernization theory: Gross Domestic Product (GDP), Purchasing Power Parity (known as PPP, or GDP per Capita), and the Urbanization Index. Gross Domestic Product measures the value of

all goods and services produced within a country's borders within a specific time frame. In this case, the time frame was yearly. Purchasing Power Parity is a measure of GDP converted to international dollars. An international dollar is equivalent to one U.S. dollar. These data are available via the World Bank website, which provided all GDP and PPP data for this study. Both variables provide the basic economic data upon which socioeconomic modernization theory hinges.The United Nations Urbanization Index provides data on how many people live in urban versus rural areas in each country. Modernization theory expects more advanced countries will have more people living in urban areas, so the UI provides a good proxy test. The United Nations website provided all the data on the Urbanization Index.

Income inequality is most easily measured by the GINI coefficient. A country's GINI number measures the income distribution of a nation. Perfect equality between residents, where each has the same income, is a "0" on the index. On the other end of the scale at "1" is perfect inequality, where one person has all the money and everyone else has none. GINI data originated from the World Bank website. If the theory of income inequality is correct, one would expect countries with less democracy to have more income inequality than those with a higher measure of democracy.

Population was the variable used for the theory of size determinant. This measure came directly from the CIA World Factbook website. Being a fairly straightforward measure, I sought to know if a large or small population had any impact on whether or not a country developed democracy.

I measured fragmentation in three ways: ethnic, linguistic and religious. All of the data came from the study by Alesina et. al. (2003). Although there are many theories on the relationship between ethnic diversity and democracy, there is no theoretical consensus on

whether high levels of fragmentation or low levels of fragmentation are more conducive to democracy.

I used the adult literacy rate of each country as the measure of literacy for each country. Literacy rate is expressed as a percentage of total population. The World Bank website provided the data for the literacy variable. In this case, "literacy" is defined as an individual who can read and write a short, simple statement on their everyday life. The definition also includes "numeracy," which is the ability to make simple arithmetic calculations. Because literacy theory expects countries with high literacy rates are likely to be democracies, I expected to find literacy was strongly correlated with democratic development.

Polity IV provided the data for political instability on its website. Polity IV provides data on major conflicts, civil wars, and authoritarian reversals for each country. The Political Instability Events variable simply counted the number of events listed for each country. The Political Instability Years variable counted the number of years each country experienced these conflicts, civil wars, and coups. I theorized even though two countries may experience the same number of political instability events, the duration of the events may also be a significant factor in democratic development.

Case Studies

For the comparative case studies, I chose the countries of Mauritius and Gabon. Despite many similarities, the level of democracy for these countries differs considerably. Mauritius has a history of colonization by both the British and the French. The island nation is small in geographical size. Mauritius is a thriving economy, with high scores for GDP, PPP and a GINI score even lower than the United States. Many different ethnic groups inhabit the island, but do not hinder democratic function in the country. Mauritius does not have a long history of political instability, nor many political instability events. Mauritius has positive numbers for many of the

variables used in my analysis, making it a good proxy for what a well-functioning African democracy looks like.

Gabon, on the other hand, has a negative value for many of the variables in my analysis. Low scores for income equality and years of political instability characterize this jungle country. Gabon has a relatively high (among African countries) PPP, yet low scores for democracy, making Gabon a good test of Lipset's socioeconomic modernization theory. Gabon is also characterized by high levels of ethnic and linguistic fragmentation with relatively few political instability events.

Mauritius and Gabon are relatively small countries with similar population sizes, and a significant number of citizens with foreign ancestry. Each country has natural resources upon which it relies for economic growth. Furthermore, each country has a history of western colonialism eventually leading to "democracy." For Mauritius, democracy functions well and efficiently, while Gabon's remains a democracy in name only. Mauritius and Gabon remain wildly different on not only scores for democracy, but human development and income inequality, as well. My case study analysis will use the results I obtained from the meta-analysis in order to determine what accounts for the incredibly different outcomes of the two countries.

Evaluation

In order to properly evaluate what effect each variable has upon democracy, I used a regression analysis. Because of its ability to evaluate each factor against the others with equal weight, a regression analysis provided a statistically solid and valid outcome. I used Polity IV and Freedom House democracy scores as the dependent variables, with the other key variables previously listed as dependents. Some analyses included different groupings of variables in order to test whether certain combinations of factors have more influence over democracy than others.

Research and Analysis

Preliminary Research

Because of the sheer amount of scholarship linking colonial heritage with democratic development, I initially expected to find colonialism would be, by far, the most important. To my surprise, my analysis showed colonial heritage to be statistically insignificant. My results reinforce the literature from Olsson showing Imperial-era colonization did not provide adequate time for democratic practices to be normalized into colonies.

The first run of analysis also showed population was the most important variable. The outcome required further research and analysis; I had to find more specific variables to explain the importance of the population variable. Refinement of the population variable was the genesis of the inclusion of literacy rates, GINI coefficients, and the urbanization index. Adding in these values proved to have a much higher explanatory value and added robustness to the findings I generated.

Finally, my original analysis only included the number of different ethnic groups in countries as the proxy for ethnic fragmentation. But this number had insufficient explanatory value, never reaching statistical significance. I then obtained more detailed fragmentation data from Alesina et. al. (2003). Data from their fragmentation study gave detailed breakdowns of ethnic, linguistic and religious fragmentation for each country. Inclusion of the more detailed fragmentation variables enabled a much more robust analysis.The results of my analysis contradict current literature. For Africa only, the most significant influences on democracy appear to be the number of years a country has experienced political instability, the number of political instability events a country experienced, and to what extent a country is linguistically fragmented. Ethnic fragmentation, income inequality, religious fragmentation, and urbanization are also strongly correlated with democracy, but do not reach statistical significance.

Interestingly, income and literacy rate appear to have almost no influence upon the development of democracy. When compared to non-African countries, political instability events, income inequality, and urbanization emerge as the most influential factors. However, linguistic and ethnic fragmentation are nearly statistically significant, as well. When all countries are compared, the most influential factors in degree of democratization appear to be the number of political instability events, degree of urbanization, ethnic fragmentation, and religious fragmentation. Religious fragmentation is only significant in one model, but reaches near significance in all others.

Africa's Democracy Scores

Non-Influential Factors

When I compared the Freedom House score for democracy with all variables, several previously identified by literature as being instrumental to democratic development do not reach statistical significance. While neither British nor French colonial history reached significance in the models, my case studies will show how these variables do make an impact in the real world. And while the variable for landlocked countries did not reach significance in Africa, it did do so for some models in the rest of the world. Most surprisingly, political instability events had no significant impact on Freedom House democracy scores, whereas the Polity IV model showed them to be highly significant.

Table 1: Factors Affecting Freedom House and Polity IV Democracy Scores (Africa)

Variable	Model 1 (FH)	Model 2 (FH)	Model 3 (P4)	Model 4 (P4)
Political Instability (Years)	**-2.423***	**-2.351***	**-1.859**	**-2.340***
	(.028)	**(.029)**	**(.088)**	**(.083)**
Political Instability Events	**.057**	**.991**	**1.926**	**2.172***
	(.369)	**(.364)**	**(1.171)**	**(1.081)**
Ethnic Fragmentation	**-1.594**		**-.401**	
	(1.286)		**(4.140)**	
Religious Fragmentation	**1.923**	**1.278**	**1.948**	**.504**
	(1.161)	**(1.333)**	**(3.617)**	**(4.056)**
GDP per Capita	**-.619**		**.078**	
	(.002)		**(.007)**	
French Colony	**.010**		**-1.120**	
	(.690)		**(2.181)**	
British Colony	**.070**		**-.742**	
	(.661)		**(2.125)**	
Landlocked	**-1.928**		**-.297**	
	(.647)		**(2.002)**	
Population	**.635**		**-.300**	
	(000)		**(000)**	
Linguistic Fragmentation		**.671**		**1.171**
		(1.347)		**(3.989)**
GINI		**.700**		**.877**
		(2.951)		**(9.039)**
Urbanization		**.471**		**-.691**
		(.018)		**(.052)**
Adult Literacy Rate		**.935**		**1.134**
		(.019)		**(.055)**
Observations	**54**	**54**	**54**	**54**
Adjusted R^2	**.162**	**.116**	**.021**	**.105**

Standard errors in parentheses * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p <.001

Possible Factors

A few other variables did not reach significance, but did come closer than the ones previously mentioned. These variables sometimes reached significance in certain analysis groupings. Consistent with theory, urbanization was positively correlated with scores of democracy. Ethnic fragmentation was negatively associated with democracy. Religious fragmentation, on the other hand, was *positively* associated with democracy scores in all models. My findings suggest ethnic fragmentation hinders democracy. Though religious freedom is more readily realized in more democratic countries, ethnic diversity may not be as well-tolerated.

Many of the same trends seen in the Freedom House results emerge in the Polity IV analysis when run against the available variables. Years of political instability reached significance at the .05 level, and, just as in the Freedom House analysis, was strongly negatively correlated. Ethnic fragmentation was also very negatively correlated, but the significance was not as high. Religious fragmentation did not reach significance in this analysis, but the direction of its relationship remained positive, just as in the Freedom House analysis. French colonial history was much more influential in the Polity IV model, but no matter the variable configuration, colonial history never really came close to reaching statistical significance.

Significant Factors

The only variable reaching significance at the .05 level in the African Freedom House variable grouping was the number of years a country experienced political instability. The greater the number of years a country in Africa experienced turmoil, the less likely that country was to be democratic. Political instability theory predicted such a result. However, no other variables reaching significance for the Freedom House models was completely unexpected, given the amount of emphasis other theories have given to the other analyzed variables, particularly economic variables. Although my findings suggest economics could be important for

some countries, African countries appear to rely upon the elimination of conflict in order to develop democracy. In the fourth model, the number of years of instability and the number of political instability events became the most significant predictor of democracy. Linguistic fragmentation has an even stronger positive correlation in the Polity IV model than in the Freedom House analysis.

Although no concrete causal factors can be identified from the analysis, my models suggest there are really only two things correlated with democracy in Africa. The first, and most important, is number of years a country experiences political instability, the most consistent and generalizable finding for the Freedom House scores. Years of political instability is the only variable that reached true statistical significance for Freedom House democracy scores. For the Polity IV models, both political instability events and the number of instability years were statistically significant. This result suggests African countries need some amount of conflict in order to develop democracy, but these conflicts cannot drag on indefinitely. The longer a country experiences turmoil, the less likely the country is to be democratic. But when that same country experiences a greater number of instability events, a stronger, positive connection with democracy occurs. Additionally, increasing religious diversity appears to play a positive role, as well, but the mechanism through which it achieves the benefit is unclear. Religious autocracies may explain how singular religions can stifle democracies, but such a conclusion cannot be concretely drawn from the data.

Sorting African Factors

Each model values some factors over others. For instance, the landlocked variable was much more significant for the Freedom House analysis than for the Polity IV. The opposite was true for the number of political instability events and the colonization variables. The results suggest some kind of correlation for the previous factors. However, the real-world impact of

these factors is unclear from the data. Ethnic fragmentation was negatively associated with democracy for both models, but never quite reached statistical significance. Ethnic fragmentation cannot be said to be one of the most important factors for democracy. However, the number of years a country in Africa experienced political instability was highly significant in both models. Although the data show some of these factors to be insignificant, my case studies will show their applicability..

What Causes Political Instability

When running an analysis with the number of political instability events as the dependent variable, population size was the only variable significantly correlated with a higher number of events. With the number of years of political instability as the dependent variable, not only is population size significant, but urbanization emerges as important, as well. While the correlation between the two dependent variables and population is positive, urbanization is negatively correlated. Neither income inequality nor PPP approached significance, indicating these conflicts are solely over money, or the lack thereof. Literacy rate does not reach statistical significance, nor does any kind of fragmentation.

In-Depth Case Studies

My analysis revealed the factors appearing to be most important to African democratic development -- keeping political instability to a minimum, allowing for the possibility of democratic political revolution and the minimization of ethnic fragmentation. I used these variables to analyze the history of two African countries, Mauritius and Gabon, in order to determine whether or not my results would hold any prescriptive solutions for Africa. If either country showed how each variable could be used, or was missing from the equation, a practical application for these variables would emerge. Fortunately, both Mauritius and Gabon show how the most important variables were and were not used throughout each country's development

after each became independent. Mauritius was very good at limiting political instability and integrating different ethnicities. Gabon, on the other hand, failed at both tasks.

Mauritius' Positive Colonial Groundwork

The groundwork for democratic cooperation in Mauritius was established very early on via colonization by the French and British. Until Dutch settlers landed on the shores in 1507, Mauritius was an uninhabited island. The Dutch subsequently introduced the island's most important crop – sugarcane (Republic of Mauritius, 2012). But the Dutch were unable to turn a profit from the island, and abandoned Mauritius by 1710. The French recolonized the island in 1715, bringing to Mauritius many structural improvements, such as shipyards and barracks. Under French colonization, sugar plantations really rooted themselves in the island, making a few French elites very wealthy via the importation of slave labor. In 1810, during the midst of the Napoleonic Wars, Great Britain launched an attack and captured the island. The French officially ceded Mauritius to Britain in 1814 in the Treaty of Paris.

The transition to democracy is difficult and fraught with peril. Democracy requires a solid foundation in order to really work. The British slowly introduced reforms enabling the people to self-rule. The establishment of the rule of law started the reforms. Mauritius retained a French legal system, with mostly autonomous French-speaking natives in charge. The institutional framework appears to have been larger in Mauritius than in other colonies. As citizens became more experienced, institutions grew larger, yet relied on an increasing number of Mauritians instead of British overseers. Mauritius, with many different non-native ethnicities, "grew up" with a history of self-determination.

The unique colonial history of Mauritius was an anomaly for British colonies. Most of the other countries in Africa did not experience colonial rule for the same long duration as Mauritius. As a colony, Mauritius had a large, functional state apparatus with four times the per

capita state revenue, three times the number of police officers, and ten times the number of magistrate court cases when compared to other British colonies (Lange, 2003). By the twentieth century, there were over 4,000 non-military state employees, of whom 93% were native Mauritians. By 1960, 85% of all officer-level position were filled by Mauritians, which was up from a high among British colonies of 65% in 1932. When the colony belonged to the French, extensive legal frameworks were established and carried over to British rule. However, because the governing body relied on parts of the Napoleonic Code, the legal system was usually administered by native French-speaking Mauritians instead of British officers (Lange, 2003). The Mauritian system thus had more autonomy than other British colonies. With nearly fifty-seven court cases per 1,000 Mauritians, the rule of law was established nearly 100 years before formal independence. The duration Mauritius experienced colonial rule could explain why the island is such a comparatively successful democracy.

Today, Mauritius is a shining example of how democracy can work in Africa. The island currently boasts a population of 1.3 million people, and GDP per capita of $13,960 USD (World Bank, 2015). Mauritian press is considered completely free, and the island scores a 1.5 out 7 on the Freedom House scale (1 being the best score possible). Mauritius has made great strides in the Human Development Index in the past thirty years, going from a score of .546 in 1980 to its current .728 (out of a possible 1.000) (United Nations Development Programme, 2015). Mauritian governments have been made up of cross-party coalitions since independence (Gerring, 2011).

Gabon's Rocky Colonial Foundation

Originally the home of the pygmies and Bantu ethnic groups, Gabon lies on the north-western rim of sub-Saharan Africa. The area was named "Gabao" by Portuguese traders, who arrived in the 15th century. The French were the first to explore the dense interior jungle in the

mid-eighteenth century. Soon after, the Dutch, British and French followed suit, and the area quickly became a hub of the Atlantic Slave trade (Bureau of African Affairs, 2012). The French began to consolidate their power in the region as early as 1849 by signing treaties with coastal chiefs. The capital, *Libreville*, arose out of a series of settlements along the Komo River. The French navy administered Gabon during the first three decades of French rule, illustrating just how unimportant the French considered the area (Rich, 2001). Although the French claimed Gabon, serious administrative efforts did not occur until 1903. In the time leading up to administration, Gabonese coastal chiefs remained somewhat autonomous.

Mpongwe middlemen were able to determine the value of trade goods and products coming out of Gabon when dealing with foreign merchants. Foreign merchants would then provide advances of trade goods in exchange for these products. The arrangement was called the "trust" system. Foreign traders were routinely exasperated at the locals, who would often keep an abundance of the trusts, stating trust value was much lower in relation to the goods provided in exchange. In 1876, a mandate by the French government spurred French colonial authorities to raise duties on imported goods (Rich, 2001) The taxes would raise the price of goods commonly used in transactions by Omyene coastal traders occupying Coastal Gabon and controlling the Ogooue River. Locals responded by refusing to sell food to European traders, launching a very effective boycott proving autonomy from the French. Boycotts would remain one of the most effective ways for locals to demonstrate a challenge to French authority over the next fifty years (Rich, 2001). Unlike Mauritius, colonial powers in Gabon never developed the authority to impose their own rule of law superseding that of the locals.

Today, Gabon has a population of 1.5 million people. According to Freedom House, Gabonese press is not free, and the country scores a lowly 5.5 out of 7 on the freedom scale, despite being a "democracy." Gabon scores well on the GDP per capita index, with a very high

(for sub-Saharan Africa, at least) $13,170 USD. As noted earlier, though, the GDP number is a bit skewed by the very wealthy individuals who benefit from the oil and mineral profits in the country, with a GINI score of .457. Gabon ranks only 106 on the Human Development Index. Despite starting in 1980 with a score of .522 and Gabon has only risen to .674 today. Mauritius started with a very similar score in 1980, but has made much better progress in the HDI in the same time frame.

Mauritius' Colonial History Helps Limit Ethnic Fragmentation

When the British first arrived, government administrators depended upon the support of the French elite who were still loyal to the French *ancien regime* and had no love for the new French republic (Ballhatchet, 1985). However, the British soon grew to distrust the loyalty of the French, and turned to the Creole population (which generally refers to any person born on the island or those of mixed birth) for support. In 1835, the British outlawed slavery on Mauritius, which began to shift the balance of the population, as plantation owners looked to indentured servants from India to fill the new labor void. By the middle of the nineteenth century, Mauritius was over half Indian. Just as before, the British began to distrust the Creoles' loyalty, and looked to Indian leaders for support. From 1883 to 1933, the Council of Government had just ten members, and here the British looked to place the new Indian candidates.

Thus, the first legacy from colonialism was the history of representation of different minority and ethnic groups, like the non-native Indians. During the British war for South Africa, British officials began to plot ways to increase the influence of Indian voters on Mauritius. Because voting rights were based upon property ownership, there were only 295 Indian voters out of all possible 4,060 on the island (Ballhatchet, 1985). So, officials began to nominate Indian leaders whom British officials thought would remain loyal to the crown to the council should Mauritius eventually become an Indian colony, effectively increasing the influence of the Indian

population without the need to formally give Indian individuals any voting rights. In 1947, male and female suffrage was introduced, based upon literacy requirements. Because many Indian women remained illiterate, the French and Creole supported suffrage. The increased votes among non-Indians would possibly confer an advantage to the French and Creole. The Council of Government was disbanded by the British, and put into place the Legislative Council, composed of nineteen elected members, twelve appointed members and three ex-officio members (Republic of Mauritius, 2012). When universal suffrage was proposed in 1956, Indians, who had originally opposed female suffrage, were fully behind the idea, considering Indians had become a majority of the population on the island. However, minority groups, such as the Muslim and Chinese, also began to assert some authority. Eventually, all groups agreed to reforms for universal suffrage including provisions for representation of minority groups. What emerged was the structure of government seen today.

Instead of a "winner take all" system, Mauritians have embraced the notion of *consociationalism*, the idea that all minority groups are guaranteed representation in the government. Prior to the election, each candidate must register as a member of one of the four officially recognized ethnicities: Hindu, Muslim, Sino-Mauritian, or General Population. Mauritius has twenty three-seat constituencies, half in rural areas populated by the Hindu Indians, who make up a little over half of the ethnicity of the island, and half in the urban areas, where everyone else lives (Srebrenik, 2002). The three candidates in each constituency with the highest vote totals are elected. Additionally, there are up to eight seats awarded to the party whose candidates lost their elections. Following the election, any group with a representation level below the actual percentage of that group's population level is awarded seats to correct the imbalance through the "Best Loser System" (Fessha et. al., 2015). That is, the candidates who

performed best without being elected and who also represent the most under-represented ethnic group following the elections are awarded the final seats.

The abolition of slavery helped integrate Mauritian society. Former slaves moved to the capital of Port Louis or to small fishing villages to work for themselves (Lange, 2003). To compensate for the loss of labor, 300,000 indentured servants from India and 1,000 Chinese came to Mauritius. However, the former slaves were generally subject to ill-treatment, just as they had been as slaves, and soon after, as a result of movements geared toward securing better treatment for indentured servants, contracts tying workers to estates were abolished. These workers secured better rights and began to buy the less-productive land sold off by estate owners. Rural settlements soon popped up with local communities and associations. Ethnic integration is yet another institution that was a precursor to democracy in Mauritius.

Political consensus would serve them well, as economic woes plagued the country throughout the 20th century. Because Mauritius was so dependent upon sugar, minor fluctuations in harvest yields and world prices would have significant adverse effects on the economy. When an economic crisis hit in 1907, sugar plantations were under enormous pressure. There was a call for government-backed loans to help out the planters. But, in accordance with free-market principles, the colonial authorities refused, preferring instead to form a commission to see if cuts could be made in different governmental areas to make up the difference (Ballhatchet, 1985). The government eventually tried to solve the problem of reliance on sugarcane by diversifying into tourism, manufacturing, banking and technology. However, diversifying measures proved to be ineffective. Additionally, the Mauritian government was unable to control spending. As a result, foreign direct investment shrank drastically and public debt rose (Gerring, 2011), forcing Mauritius to turn to the World Bank and IMF for help. Structural Adjustment Programs (SAP) from the World Bank and IMF standby arrangements were prescribed to get Mauritius on the

path to prosperity. Both the World Bank and IMF devalued the currency, reduced the deficit and instituted reforms to increase foreign capital reserves (Gerring, 2011). The reform measures worked beautifully, and Mauritius produced such extraordinary growth, the island was termed an "African Tiger," a play on the epithet given to similar rises in prosperity among the "Asian Tigers." But no prosperity would have been possible without democratic cooperation.

Consociationalism has served to foster a sense of cooperation and consensus among parties, allowing policymakers to carry through on policy decisions made by previous administrations. When Mauritius encountered economic difficulties, the World Bank recommended Structural Adjustment Programs to help alleviate the problems. Continuity is, no doubt, one of the prime reasons the SAPs have worked so well in Mauritius. The SAPs recommended by the World Bank and IMF were followed through three consecutive governments. That the governments all decided the reforms had to be followed is nothing short of a democratic miracle, considering the political and ethnic unrest just two short decades before. The history of democracy throughout the colonial period and the institution of consociational arrangements no doubt played a huge role in these developments.

Post-independence, minority groups retained a voice in the government. Consociationalism provided an avenue to address minority groups' issues. For instance, the SAP economic reforms were generally conservative reforms. In an effort to appease the minority groups, government spending was reduced without reducing social welfare outlays (Gerring, 2011). Yet, in a typical conservative fashion, social welfare outlays in the future were restricted. Each group got a "win," and, as a result, were much more willing to see the reforms through to the end. Again, consociational arrangements increased the legitimacy of the government.

Consociationalism provided a steadying influence over the transition to democracy. The importance of the pursuit of centrist policies and the inclusion of minority groups in

representation cannot be overstated. Integration of ethnic groups that led to the decrease in political instability that generally proves to be a fractious force in democracies in Africa. Consociationalism allowed the development of economic prosperity through following the prescriptions of the IMF and World Bank. But, even Mauritius' unique system of government has roots in the institutional representative framework going all the way back to the 1800s. Institutions appear to be, by far, the foundation of democracy in Mauritius. The effectiveness of the Mauritian government in creating a voice for each different ethnic group to address concerns and manage political unrest appears to be the most important factor in the development of democracy in Mauritius. This is consistent with the previous analysis of the larger factors of African democracy.

Gabon's History of Ethnic Fractionalization

Natives of Gabon always saw themselves as having at least the same status as foreigners, a sentiment that would later be used to divide the different ethnic groups in Gabon and prevent the kind of camaraderie and positive nationalism that could lead to more democratic outcomes for Gabon. Omyene traders, along with most coastal African communities, treated Europeans as strangers owing the locals respect and gifts. The native traders would often manipulate the differences in the value of trade goods to their advantage. The Omyene quickly adapted to the colonial period by maintaining the right to define the terms of trade, often appointing Europeans as official emissaries (Rich, 2001). European officials would often serve as intermediaries between communities along the Ogooue River and the European powers. Often, the negotiations involved the trading of slaves, which had become the main economic occupation of the Omyene (Rich, 2001). The abolition of slavery in various countries in the 1860s and 1870s damaged the incomes of these river traders, who sometimes turned to attacking passing European vessels to support themselves. The abolition of slavery meant the loss of prestige and independence for

Gabonese men, just like other West African coastal settlements. The end of Atlantic slave export business and the growth of European merchant markets caused Gabonese men to shift from entrepreneurial roles to wage labor and become representatives of European firms.

French was taught as the primary language, reinforcing the images and ideals of the Democratic Party of Gabon. Due to the large number of natural resources, namely oil and minerals, Gabon flourished economically. Gabon's economic prosperity led to the necessity for a large number of infrastructure projects. However, due to Gabon's size and lack of a work force, foreign labor was required to complete the infrastructure projects. In the 1970s, nearly 100,000 people, some 20% of the population, were foreign workers (Gray, 1998). The Gabonese valued the relatively high income from oil and mineral deposits.

The state continued to worsen the division between Gabonese and foreigners. In 1984, President Omar Bongo insisted immigration was a problem and had to be controlled (Gray, 1998). Bongo first decried prostitution, identifying all prostitutes as foreigners. The President continued on, saying foreigners should be "handed over to the army" so that once "five or six soldiers have been on top them," the foreigners would see prostitution is not wanted in Gabon. Next, Bongo railed against the Lebanese, leading to an outbreak of looting directed at Lebanese merchants in the city of Libreville. Finally, foreign worker cards were issued to the immigrants. However, the cards came at an extremely high price, costing $200 USD for the card, and another $1,000 if the worker decided to leave and then return to Gabon. Today, tensions between the Gabonese and the foreign contingent remain high, but have been somewhat tempered by economic hardship affecting both the natives and non-natives. Still, nearly 90% of the wealth in the country is controlled by only 20% of the population (Bureau of African Affairs, 2012).

How Mauritius Limits Political Violence and Instability

Throughout the history of the island, the Mauritian government had to deal with the challenge of political representation for the citizenry. Accommodation can be seen in cases like the agricultural labor riots in Mauritius in 1937, 1938, and 1943, which forced the Mauritian government to create state institutions representing the labor class. The economic depression of the 1930s led to low sugar prices and low wages (Alladin, 1986). Small planters were unable to choose to whom the sugar could be sold (Lange, 2003). On a more general scale, rural sugarcane farmer interests were ignored altogether. But, because of local community associational networks (village and district councils) popping up, there was significant organizational structure to the protests, which included sit-ins, strikes and even destruction of property and violence. The protests happened to coincide with the British government's readiness to decentralize administration and services. Legislative reform was introduced through universal suffrage, and the first Mauritian prime minister was elected in 1961, seven years before formal independence. The government created the Department of Labor, which could effectively mediate between labor and producer associations.

Mauritius' transition from a colony to an independent state was hardly seamless. There were many rebellions and conflicts requiring British troop intervention past the date of official independence. In the years surrounding independence, contention developed along party lines, which usually followed ethnic lines. The Mauritius Social Democratic Party (PMSD) was the conservative party, supported by the Franco-Mauritian elite and Creole. The liberal Mauritian Labor Party was supported by the Indo-Mauritians, and the Mauritian Militant Movement was a Marxist party supported by mixed ethnicities (Gerring, 2011). Each party was distrustful of the others, and political disagreement frequently turned to ethnic violence. Disorder and political chaos lasted into the 1970s, until voting along ethnic lines began to shift to voting along class

lines. Because the PMSD catered only to the interests of the rich Franco-Mauritians, the support base of the Creole, who made up a far larger proportion of its total vote, disappeared. The PMSD began to adopt more centrist policies in order to win back the poor Creoles. The liberal MMM party realized radical positions could not entice a majority, either, and began to move toward the center, so as to attract Hindu landowners. With each party adopting less divisive positions, violence subsided and cooperation began in earnest.

Gabon's Policies Did Not Limit Violence

Libreville erupted with violence in the 1870s, as a series of murders struck the city. Leopards were a powerful symbol of sorcery in the area, and the murderers dressed up as "Leopard Men" while perpetrating the acts. Murderers mutilated corpses with what appeared to be claw marks and left paw prints near the bodies. French officials rounded up several slaves, and executed ten via firing squad, but the murders continued. Slaves and women were the preferred targets. Women, in particular, were targeted due to the increasing ability, via prostitution, to challenge male authority (Rich, 2001). In the rural estuary region, armed groups of Africans regularly fought each other as well as the French up until the first World War (Rich, 2007). The failure of French officials to stop the killings and the fighting underscored the lack of institutionalism pervading the country.The ability of a state to stop violence, especially violence targeting minority groups, is a crucial factor in the development of democracy, as shown by the Polity IV and Freedom House analyses.

Tensions between "rightful" or "native" Gabonese and immigrants had already exploded into violence during a 1962 football match. Gabon and Congo were playing for the Coupe des Tropiques. The match ended with some 30,000 Congolese attacking the referee and threatening the Gabonese national team. When news of the attack reached Libreville, Gabonese retaliated against the immigrant Congolese in the city, resulting in two days of rioting, leaving nine people

dead and another thirty wounded (Gray, 1998). Hundreds of Congolese homes were burned to the ground, and 2,700 Congolese were expelled from Pointe-Noire.

Some 60,000 refugees came to Gabon from Equatorial Guinea in the 1970s, as well. The refugees were of Fang ethnicity and had relationships with many Gabonese. Still, the large influx of people put pressure on an already strained food supply, which led to a brief eruption of violence in Libreville, mainly in the market centers. Foreigners from Benin were blamed for the violence, and some 10,000 were expelled on July 23, 1978 (Gray, 1998). A 1981 football match was another catalyst for ethnic violence; only this time, the violence was directed toward Cameroonian ethnics. In Libreville, eyewitnesses even reported the police were seen looting Cameroonian markets (Gray, 1998). Once again, the government expelled non-Gabonese in the form of 10,000 Cameroonians.

Mauritius Empowers Locals to Provide Services and Education

Village and district councils were organized by the government of Mauritius and formally recognized soon after World War II, which promoted an active democracy on the island. Village councils had only limited supervision, with one civil commissioner and five technical assistants per council. The councils were vital in the development of schools, roads, health centers, town halls, and sanitation and water departments (Lange, 2003). Villages oversaw their own school systems, and the number of schools nearly doubled from 128 in 1946 to 230 by 1967. In 2011, the government spent 13% of its budget on education (Republic of Mauritius, 2012). Universal education echoed another advantage of colonialism – the tradition of education and literacy. The Creole received education as far back as French rule, and even during that time, many of the middle class were doctors, teachers and lawyers (Ballhatchet, 1985). During British colonial rule, there were many state-funded schools. The Royal College was one such school. The wealthier boys were funneled to Britain for higher education, while poorer men were sometimes granted

Royal College scholarships in order to study in Britain (Ballhatchet, 1985). The aforementioned educational tradition continues to the present day. Though education does not emerge as a significant factor in my analysis for generalized African democratic development, it does appear to be an important part of the history of political representation of all ethnicities in Mauritius.

Village councils were also instrumental in the creation of numerous social welfare programs, including poverty alleviation and health improvements. Between 1950 and 1967, thirty-two child and maternal welfare centers were opened in rural areas. The government led the village councils to encourage the local populations to control diseases with canalization of rivers, draining marshes, construction of irrigation systems and the application of insecticides to the interior of buildings (Lange, 2003). Such efforts resulted in the elimination of death from malaria, which was 3,534 in 1946, representing 23% of all deaths on the island, by 1956. 4,052 deaths came from infectious diseases in 1948, but by 1967, only 187 deaths came from disease. Poverty alleviation was encouraged with the use of poor-law boards, and village councils distributed funds to needy village members. Mauritius had over 120,000 cases of state assistance in 1967, yet the office employed only ten people. The 200 mutual aid associations on the island were vital in helping to distribute assistance funds. Cooperative credit societies were also the domain of local village councils. Co-op programs fielded 33,000 members in 320 different co-ops by 1960. Cooperative credit societies were instrumental in the near doubling of sugar cane production from 1912 to 1959 (Lange, 2003).

> "Thus it appears that the benefits provided by the state strengthened an already dense society, while societal associations increased the power of a state already possessing high levels of coordination capacity, thereby promoting a virtuous circle of development in colonial Mauritius and providing an institutional endowment needed for continued, broad-based development after independence (Lange, 2003)."

The effectiveness of the village associations in promoting education, improving the dialogue between interest groups (such as farmers) and the government, and the drastic improvement in health is amazing.

Gabon's Disenfranchisement of the Population

Rather than producing food, Gabon has long imported it. During the first World War, food scarcity proved to be a problem having long-lasting effects on the country, dividing Gabon in ways persisting to the present day. Slaves working local farms had been one way the wealthy Mpongwe fed themselves. The Mpongwe's inability to secure new sources of labor required locals to turn to banked wealth for the provision of food. At the beginning of World War One, French and German troops fought in Gabon and Cameroon. Victorious African forces, who had fought for the French, swept into Libreville like a tidal wave in 1916, doubling the population. Laws gave military members the right to acquire food before the local populace. Due to the scarcity of food, soldiers frequently bought and resold at higher prices. Local production could not keep up with the increased demand and famine set in. The few farmers that did operate, namely of Fang ethnicity, were often subject to extortion by African guards along the roads to Libreville, extortion of bribes by village chiefs along canoe waterways, and high taxes (Rich, 2007). Additionally, wild animals were eating the crops of manioc and rice, but high prices for arms and ammunition prevented the locals from defending their food.

The crisis worsened in 1918-1919. Georges Guibet, the French head of the estuary region, suggested suspending taxation and relaxing gun laws in order to allow farmers to concentrate on producing food. The governor rejected Guibet's ideas, insisting "[The Africans'] laziness is the only reason they lack food (Rich, 2007)." The situation remained desperate, and in 1920, locals began to protest colonial officials. The boycott was not immediately successful in lowering food prices, but did sufficiently embarrass the administration so badly, Guibet was

moved to Chad. The food crisis clearly shows the inability of the rural people to influence local governmental authority. Citizens' disenfranchisement continues to the present day.

Early on, Gabon's government did not provide for the education of the populace. Catholic and Protestant missions were the main form of education in the country, but these mission efforts were routinely hampered by large bouts of disease and low levels of interest (Rich, 2001). However, the schools did attract a large number of free children, whose parents asked the missionaries to teach the children foreign languages. British and German traders offered high wages for graduates fluent in English, and education thus became a route to personal economic prosperity for the Mpongwe. Missions regularly accepted female children into schools, where the children were taught English or French, cooking and how to sew and do laundry. Proficiency in the domestic arts made the girls attractive prospects for prostitution. One woman, Marie Ndar, was so prolific that she earned enough money to purchase her own slaves.

Unlike the citizens of British Mauritius, Gabonese under the rule of the French had no political rights (Gray, 1998). Although citizens had some small amount of civil rights, only a very select number of Gabonese elites were able to obtain French citizenship. Freedoms of speech, movement and association were severely restricted. Rule was mostly authoritarian, as the people were subject to unpaid, forced labor when the colonial state needed a workforce for public projects (Gray, 1998). Punishment was often arbitrary and lacked formal codification. In 1946, the French Lamine Gueye law granted French citizenship to African subjects. Gabonese political elites were elected and sent to the French National Assembly and various governing bodies. However, politicians remained beholden to both local electorates and the powerful French political and economic interests, even after independence in 1960. Because of the inability of politicians to make truly independent decisions, a single-party state developed, reinforced via the educational system.

Gabon Illustrates Why Low Levels of Instability Can Be Negative

The electoral process in Gabon has never been quite stable. The Democratic Party of Gabon (PDG) has consolidated and split into multiple parties many times. Omar Bongo was the head of the PDG until his death in office in 2009. In 1990, the PDG moved to have multi-party elections in Gabon once more. The new elections would have more than one presidential candidate, elected for a five-year term, and could only be re-elected one time. Bongo was re-elected in 1993 with 51% of the vote. Opposition parties refused to validate the results, and civil disturbances began again. The violence concluded with the Paris Accords in 1994, when members of the opposition party were finally included in the government. However, the inclusive arrangement soon disintegrated, and Bongo once again consolidated power. In 2003, Bongo was successful in changing the terms of the Constitution to allow re-election as many times as the president desired and for a term of seven years instead of five (Reuters, 2009). Ali Bongo, the son of Omar Bongo, assumed power upon his father's death in 2009. Ali Bongo was recently re-elected in a landslide election in 2011, amidst much vocal opposition calling for a boycott of the election (BBC News, 2011). Without political instability events, non-democratic governments cannot be overturned and replaced with democracies.

Analyzing the Differences

Both Mauritius and Gabon began life as colonies in the same time period. However, unlike the French, the British empowered Mauritian citizens to get involved in the democratic process far earlier and to have more power to influence government. Village councils and associations were instrumental in the development of Mauritius, from taking the lead on education and health to organizing agricultural labor groups. By contrast, the Gabonese government restricted citizens' ability to form associations. Even by British standards, Mauritius had a lot of state employees. The Mauritian government managed to have institutional control

over the island, as well as a good handle on violence. When violence did erupt in Mauritius, it was quickly controlled and the root of the issue was ferreted out in order to prevent a recurrence. By contrast, violence in Gabon has persisted on and off for many years. Despite being a French colony, Gabon's legal system severely lacks authority and legitimacy. Mauritius, on the other hand, used the French legal apparatus quite well as the foundation of a well-rounded and robust legal apparatus.

After the abolition of slavery in Mauritius, many workers sought to purchase land. Even former Indian indentured servants got in on the act. In Gabon, despite having much more land available than Mauritius, land ownership was tightly restricted and so did not develop to any great extent. In Gabon, rural producers were routinely disenfranchised, whereas in Mauritius, the government created a special labor board to facilitate communication between businesses and labor interests. Gabon and Mauritius are both highly ethnically heterogeneous, and both have had their bouts with ethnic hostility. However, in Mauritius, ethnic disagreement has evolved into simple political disagreement, whereas the Gabonese still see ethnic tensions as a sore point of contentious disagreement and potential violence. Gabonese ethnic contention has grown into outright contempt for immigrants. Heavy-handed controls and a lack of border mobility characterize Gabon. Controls so strict do not exist in Mauritius.

In order to determine what lessons may be applied across countries, what cannot be controlled or is irrelevant must first be identified and discounted. This leaves institutions as the foundational difference between Mauritius and Gabon. Mauritius and Gabon are nearly identical in size, with similar ethnic heterogeneity. Education and literacy rates are impressive for both countries. According to the UNICEF, Gabon's literacy rate is equal to Mauritius' score. While literacy statistics can be fudged quite often, and the published numbers may not quite reflect reality, the oil revenue in Gabon allows them to spend quite liberally on education, even if much

of the education is teaching the PDG party line. Put simply, the British invested heavily in building strong, lasting institutions empowering the Mauritians to eventually self-govern. The French did nothing of the sort in Gabon.

Mauritius has good governance, while Gabon does not. Good governance is defined by a few characteristics. The first is how much of a voice the citizens have in the government and whether or not the government is held accountable for its actions. Accountability gets into the notion of political equality (Rothstein, 2008). Gabon clearly does not have political equality. Gabon's systematic disenfranchisement of ethnic minorities and more general restriction of access to the political process is anathema to good governance. The PDG has said in the past a multiple party government is impossible in Gabon because the population is too small (Bureau of African Affairs, 2012). The case of Mauritius shows the PDG's conclusion to be a clear falsehood. Gabon must take things one step further, though, and institute a form of Consociationalism. While some critics have accused consociational agreements of further deepening ethnic differences and reinforcing ethnosectarianism (Kasenally, 2007), there is no doubt consociationalist arrangements provide for the decline of violence and move toward inter-ethnic peace (Gerring, 2011).

The second characteristic of good governance is political stability and the absence of violence. Gabon has certainly had political stability, but stability has come at the cost of undermining the democratic process. The Bongo administration continually manipulated the electorate in order to retain as much power as possible, and Bongo's political machinations show no sign of abating. As the data show, the number of events of political instability are not what undermines democracy. In fact, Gabon shows why a lack of political instability can be bad; if an authoritarian government never loses power, democracy can never take root. Simultaneously, Gabon has had a large number of years of political instability and violence. Gabon's years of

political instability and violence lines up with the data showing that the longer an African country experiences violence and instability, the less likely that country is to be democratic. Neither long term political instability nor a large number of political instability events are seen in Mauritius.

The Rest of the World

Table 2: Factors Affecting Freedom House and Polity IV Democracy Scores (World)

Variable	Model 1 (FH)	Model 2 (FH)	Model 3 (P4)	Model 4 (P4)
Political Instability (Years)	**-.621**	**-.345**	**.009**	**.013**
	(.018)	**(.017)**	**(.060)**	**(.059)**
Political Instability Events	**-3.195****	**-2.955****	**-1.688**	**-1.474**
	(.240)	**(.232)**	**(.802)**	**(.793)**
Ethnic Fragmentation	**-1.576**	**-1.005**	**-1.950**	**-1.439**
	(1.048)	**(1.026)**	**(3.499)**	**(3.506)**
Religious Fragmentation	**.595**	**.648**	**.607**	**.464**
	(.970)	**(.898)**	**(3.239)**	**(3.069)**
GDP per Capita	**.082**		**-.118**	
	(.000)		**(.000)**	
Landlocked	**-2.236***	**-2.463***	**-1.313**	**-1.640**
	(.497)	**(.505)**	**(1.659)**	**(1.724)**
Population	**.373**		**.157**	
	(.000)		**(.000)**	
Linguistic Fragmentation	**-.098**	**-.486**	**-.516**	**-.865**
	(1.107)	**(1.071)**	**(3.697)**	**(3.659)**
GINI		**-.262**		**-2.057***
		(2.070)		**(7.073)**
Urbanization		**1.336**		**-.067**
		(.011)		**(.036)**
Adult Literacy Rate		**-.200**		**.474**
		(.020)		**(.069)**
Observations	**116**	**116**	**116**	**116**
Adjusted R^2	**.155**	**.223**	**.062**	**.097**

Standard errors in parentheses * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p <.001

Comparing Africa to the Rest of the World

I ran the same analyses on both the African countries and rest of the countries of the world, excluding Africa. The results were surprising. The only variable Africa had in common with the rest of the world was political instability events. The political instability events variable was significant in both groups. However, the direction was different. For Africa, the number of events was *positively* associated with better scores for democracy, while the number of events was *negatively* associated with democracy in the rest of the world. Political instability years was significant for Africa, but not the rest of the world. Finally, for the world, a high level of income inequality was negatively correlated with democracy, as was a country being landlocked. Both the GINI and landlocked variables failed to reach statistical significance for Africa. These data suggest African democracy is, indeed, a special case requiring a different approach from the rest of the world.

Factors of fragmentation - ethnic, linguistic, and religious - never reached statistical significance in the my models. However, both ethnic and linguistic fragmentation had negative correlation with scores for democracy. Interestingly, religious fragmentation had a positive correlation with higher levels of democracy, just as the African models did.

Three variables stuck out as being most important to world democracy scores. The first, and most significant, was the number of political instability events. The number of political instability events had a very strong negative correlation with scores for democracy, reaching significance at the .005 level. Reaching significance at the .05 level in two models was the variable for landlocked countries, although it remained negatively correlated in each model. Only one variable reached statistical significance at the .05 level in the Polity IV analysis, the GINI variable. High levels of income inequality were negatively associated with scores for democracy. These results are quite different than the ones obtained for Africa.

Conclusion

Africa and the rest of the world require different approaches to democratic development. While non-African countries fare poorly in democratic measures when experiencing higher political instability events, for Africa, instability events can be a good thing. As the case of Gabon shows, lack of political revolution is not necessarily a good thing. African revolution should be encouraged in non-democracies. However, revolution should not be allowed to spiral into years of political instability. The number of politically unstable years is negatively correlated with African democracy, similar to non-African countries. While the historical habitualization of democratic ideals of Mauritius may not be replicable, the lessons of consociationalism are applicable to any country struggling with ethnic fragmentation, as is the case for many African countries. Gabon illustrates the dangers of consistent ethnic fragmentation, especially when fragmentation turns to outright hatred and disenfranchisement of minority groups. Because neither urbanization nor income inequality reached statistical significance for African countries, but did for non-African countries, the lessons are not so clear. Perhaps when ethnic fragmentation issues are relieved in African countries, other variables, such as GINI and UI, may become more important.

Discussion

When I compared the factors influencing African democracy to the factors affecting the rest of the world, Africa's requirements for democracy were quite different. In order to maximize African countries' chances for democracy, my analysis suggests mitigating instability should be the number one priority. For Freedom House democracy scores, the number of years of instability is the number one predictor of African democracy. The longer an African country is unstable, the less likely it is to be democratic. The same is true for non-African countries. However, the Polity IV results reveal the number of political instability events is *positively* correlated with African democracy scores; as the number of political instability events increases, scores for democracy also rise. For non-African countries, the opposite is true; political instability events are negatively correlated with scores for democracy. Because of the difference between African and non-African factors, approaches to influencing a democratic transition must be different.

Further analysis revealed two primary causes for political instability and instability events -- population and urbanization. As population size increases, so does the number of political instability events. Urbanization, on the other hand, is negatively correlated with instability events. No other variables reach statistical significance, indicating there are no current theories on democratic development offering a comprehensive explanation of why and how African countries develop democracy. Population dispersal and urbanization in African countries are neither immediately achievable nor practical. The development of realistic solutions to Africa's political instability problems will require further refinement of the root cause of instability.

The two case studies of Mauritius and Gabon show how each influential democratic variable played out in the real world. In Mauritius' case, violence and instability was controlled,

and in Gabon, ran rampant. Mauritius mitigated violence through the use of consociational agreements and integration of different ethnic groups into political leadership positions. The rule of law was established early on during Mauritian governmental development and used consistently throughout its colonial history and during independence. Gabon, on the other hand, kept ethnic groups suppressed and disenfranchised throughout history. Gabon attempted to consolidate authority in the hands of the few in order to maintain power, but violence remained a problem. In the case of Mauritius, political instability was controlled, and ethnic diversity was used in a positive democratic manner. In Gabon, ethnic diversity was used to drive a wedge between citizens, and the condemnation of minorities was the cause of years of political violence. The different ways each country dealt with ethnic minority groups show how Mauritius ended up with a high score for democracy, while Gabon ended up at the bottom. The outcomes reflect both the Freedom House and Polity IV analysis I performed for African countries.

The results of my analysis on the rest of the world highlight large differences between Africa and other countries. Variables important to the rest of the world are insignificant in Africa, and some variables important in Africa are not influential for the rest of the world. In non-African countries, the number of political instability events is *negatively* correlated with scores for democracy. The opposite is true for Africa. Income equality and high levels of urbanization are correlated with democracy in non-African countries, while these two variables fail to reach significance for Africa.

Applications for Current Theory

I. Colonialism

Some current theory posits African colonies were not exposed to colonial rule long enough for democratic ideals to take root. Other theories connect colonialism with current-day income inequality. The case of Mauritius directly conflicts with the length of exposure theory;

Colonial rule in Mauritius laid the groundwork for democratic development and exposure was clearly of an adequate length. Additionally, income inequality, while a significant factor in non-African countries, is not a significant predictor of African democracy. Therefore, the current theory must be modified.

The beneficial legacy of colonialism for Mauritius is the incorporation of minority groups into political office and governance. Integration, not segregation and oppression, was a key factor in democratic development. I would suggest, for African countries, the democratic benefit of colonialism was seen when the colonial power chose to rule while empowering the local population. When colonial powers, perhaps due to economic, logistical or militaristic challenges, tried to suppress ethnic minorities or disenfranchise the local population, no benefits were seen. Length of colonial occupation may be correlated with the extent of indigenous empowerment, but may not be the sole determinant. Clearly, local populations could have been, as in the case of Mauritius, empowered to make decisions and become involved in local politics. But this was not the case in every country, as the case of Gabon clearly demonstrates.

II. Modernization

IIA. Socioeconomic Modernization

The data do not support the theory of socioeconomic modernization leading to democracy. Neither the African analysis nor the world analysis placed any significance upon income inequality or PPP. The two case studies of Mauritius and Gabon do not support economic modernization theory, either. Both countries' GDP per capita are similar, yet only one remains a democracy. Neither prosperity nor destitution appears to drive the growth of democracy anywhere on the globe.

IIB. Cultural Modernization

While the statistical analysis for Africa does not show any significance for cultural modernization theory, there is ample case study evidence for its efficacy. The institutions established in Mauritius certainly played a key role in maintaining peace and democracy. The same institutions are not present in Gabon, where violence and instability have reigned for decades. Worldwide, I find urbanization positively correlated with democracy, showing some degree of cultural modernization is important. The mechanisms through which institutions benefit democracy may be different in Africa than the rest of the world. Africa is one of the most ethnically diverse and divided continents. Here, institutions working to integrate and empower minority groups are at their most effective. Elsewhere, institutions may function differently, explaining why urbanization is more important in the rest of the world.

III. Income Inequality

Because the measures for PPP were insignificant for Africa, the measures of income inequality unsurprisingly failed to reach significance for the African analysis. African democracy simply does not appear to be driven by economic factors. A relatively low economic output, when Africa is compared to the rest of the world, may be one explanation. But, more likely, such matters are overshadowed by ethnic conflict and violence. Ethnic conflict and violence are seen elsewhere in the world. But as a whole, income inequality is a much stronger driver of democracy for the non-African countries. GINI measurements did turn out to be statistically significant for non-African countries. However, because the variables for political instability were wildly different for African countries vs. non, it could be that once political instability events and political conflict is relatively under control, measures such as GINI emerge as being more significant for African countries.

IV. Population and Literacy

Population and adult literacy rate did not reach statistical significance for either the African or non-African analyses. Preliminary testing revealed population was a significant contributor to democracy. When more variables were added to the analysis, population failed to reach statistical significance. The most recent finding contradicts the theories advancing population and high literacy rate as predictors of democracy. While either variable would appear to go hand-in-hand with democracy, each variable may only tangentially relate to democracy. Whatever the relationship, my findings do not show population or literacy to be significantly related to democracy in either Africa or the world.

V. Ethnic Fragmentation

Ethnic fragmentation failed to reach statistical significance in each model, but did have a strong negative correlation with democracy. My findings tentatively support Easterly and Levine's notion that ethnic fragmentation contributes to political instability. Moffazar theorized one ethnic group not holding sway over another strengthens democracy. The case study analysis provides evidence of the applicability of Moffazar's theory for African countries. Although consociationalism may not be the best solution for non-African countries as a whole, consociationalism could be beneficial for non-African non-democracies, which should be investigated in future research.

Best Theoretical Fit

The juxtaposition of Mauritius' case study and of the analyses results suggests institutions are the most important factor for African democracy. Institutions provide political stability, which directly correlates to increased scores for democracy. Institutions do not mean just the buildings or organizations interacting directly with government functions, but also organizations and methods fostering citizen involvement in the democratic process. The

mechanism by which institutions contribute to democracy are community interaction and ethnic empowerment. Through institutions, consociational agreements are made, equalizing the power between different ethnic groups, a key factor in strengthening democracy (Moffazar, 2003). Consociationalism provides proportional representation for ethnic groups, instilling a sense of fairness in the democratic process. The case study of Mauritius is a shining example of how democracy is strengthened through consociationalism.

Limitations

My research does have a few limitations. The first is the R-squared value some of the data analyses was low, indicating some factors remain unaccounted for in my analyses. More variables may be required. Degrees of freedom in my analysis was necessarily low due to the limited number of country data available. Alternatively, more specific or more unaccounted for variables could change the results in future analyses. The data itself may also be flawed. One of the problems with non-democratic countries is the data tends to be unreliable or non-existent, leading to accuracy problems. More accurate data may impact which variables have explanatory power. Many variables had to be estimated based upon best available proxy. Surely, such actions altered some of the outcomes. Finally, there may be variables which better translate existing theory into a measurable statistic, and as such, would provide more accurate analysis.

Suggestions for Future Research

The findings of my paper suggest two avenues for further research. The first is the historical extent of colonizers' enabling democracy. My analysis suggests the length of time a colonizer was involved in a country is not as important as the extent to which a power instituted policies enabling citizens to assume leadership roles and become involved in the governmental process. If colonial empowerment could be somehow measured, just as linguistic, religious and ethnic fragmentation are also measured, great explanatory power may be found, not only for

African countries, but possibly for non-African countries, as well. Second, future research could be directed toward countries who have instituted consociational agreements, and whether or not such agreements contributed to positive outcomes for the countries. Then, countries with similar circumstances, but not consociational agreements, might be compared in order to determine whether there is a positive democratic benefit to consociationalism in either African or non-African countries..

Takeaways

Limiting instability appears to be the most important factor in African democratic development. An effective way of dealing with instability is limiting the effects of ethnic fragmentation, especially in Africa, with its huge amount of ethnic diversity and history of inter-ethnic conflict. Consociational agreements are one way of limiting the negative effects of such fragmentation. Empowerment of minority groups, ensuring each has a representational voice in government, helps ethnic groups find common ground. When disparate groups work together, political instability and violence are lessened.

Several factors reaching significance in a world context failed to reach significance in Africa. My analysis suggests Africa is a special case for democracy. African countries require a different approach from the rest of the world. While political instability events are negatively associated with democracy in the rest of the world, the finding that such events are positively correlated with democracy in Africa suggests Africans tend to fight for democracy. If one event does not result in a favorable outcome, African countries will continue to fight toward democracy. Such changes do not happen overnight, but through limiting political instability, Africa may reach the threshold for democracy.

Works Cited

Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., Robinson, J. A., & Yared, P. (2009). Reevaluating the modernization hypothesis. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, *56*(8), 1043-1058.

Alesina, A., Baqir, R., & Easterly, W. (1997). Public goods and ethnic divisions. National Bureau of Economic Research.

Alesina, A., & Ferrara, E. L. (2004). Ethnic diversity and economic performance. National Bureau of Economic Research.

Alladin, M. I. "Economic Development in a Plantation Economy: The Decline of the Sugar Industry in Mauritius." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 21.4 (1986): 88-106. Print.

Anckar, C. "Size, Islandness, and Democracy: A Global Comparison." *International Political Science Review* 29.4 (2008): 433-59. Print.

Anckar, Dag, and Carsten Anckar. "Size, Insularity and Democracy." *Scandinavian Political Studies* 18.4 (1995): 211-28. Web. 5 May 2012. <http://e-tidsskrifter.dk/ojs/index.php/scandinavian_political_studies/article/view/13265/25277>.

Anckar, Dag. "Islandness or Smallness? A Comparative Look at Political Institutions in Small Island States." *Journal of Island Studies* 1.1 (2006): 43-54. Print.

Anckar, Dag. "Small Is Democratic, But Who Is Small?" *Arts and Social Sciences Journal* 2010 (2010): 1-10. *ASSJ*. Jan. 2010. Web. 5 May 2012. <http://astonjournals.com/assj>.

Anckar, Dag. "Why Are Small Island States Democracies?" *The Round Table* 91.365 (2002): 375-90. Print.

Angeles, L. (2007). Income inequality and colonialism. *European Economic Review*, *51*(5), 1155-1176.

Ballhatchet, Kenneth. "The Structure of British Official Attitudes: Colonial Mauritius, 1883-1968." *The Historical Journal* 38.4 (1995): 989-1011. Print.

Bardhan, P. (1993). Symposium on democracy and development. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *7*(3), 45-49.

BBC News. "Gabon's Coalition Wins Landslide Victory." *BBC News*. BBC, 22 Dec. 2011. Web. 10 May 2012. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-16299172>.

Beaulieu, Emily, and Susan D. Hyde. "In the Shadow of Democracy Promotion: Strategic Manipulation, International Observers, and Election Boycotts." *Comparative Political Studies* 42.3 (2008): 392-415. Print.

Bernhard, M., Reenock, C., & Nordstrom, T. (2004). The legacy of Western overseas colonialism on democratic survival. *International Studies Quarterly*, *48*(1), 225-250.

Birnir, J. (2007). Divergence in diversity? The dissimilar effects of cleavages on electoral politics in new democracies. *American Journal of Political Science*, *51*(3), 602-619.

Bollen, K. A., & Jackman, R. W. (1989). Democracy, stability, and dichotomies. *American Sociological Review*, 612-621.

Bräutigam, D. A., & Knack, S. (2004). Foreign Aid, Institutions, and Governance in Sub-Saharan Africa*. *Economic development and cultural change*, *52*(2), 255-285.

Bureau of African Affairs. "Background Note: Gabon." *U.S. Department of State*. U.S. Department of State, 12 Mar. 2012. Web. 10 May 2012. <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/2826.htm>.

Charron, Nicholas, and Victor LaPuente. "Does Democracy Produce Quality of Government." *European Journal of Political Research* 49 (2010): 443-70. Print.

Clague, C., Gleason, S., & Knack, S. (2001). Determinants of lasting democracy in poor countries: Culture, development, and institutions. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *573*(1), 16-41.

Clark, John Frank. "The Decline of the African Military Coup." *Journal of Democracy* 18.3 (2007): 141-55. Print.

Cutwright, Phillips. "National Political Development: Measurement and Analysis." *American Sociological Review* 28.2 (1963): 253-64. Print.

Dahl, Robert Alan, and Edward R. Tufte. *Size and Democracy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1973. Print.

De Haas, Hein. "International Migration, Remittances and Development: Myths and Facts." *Third World Quarterly* 26.8 (2005): 1269-284. Print.

Dervis, Kemal. "Governance and Development." *Journal of Democracy* 17.4 (2006): 153-59. Print.

DoingBusiness.org. "Economy Rankings." *Ranking of Economies*. Web. 11 May 2012. <http://www.doingbusiness.org/DoingBusiness/Rankings>.

Easterly, W., & Levine, R. (1997). Africa's growth tragedy: policies and ethnic divisions. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1203-1250.

Eckstein, H. (1997). Congruence theory explained. *Center for the Study of Democracy*.

Eckstein, H. (1966). Division and Cohesion in Democracy: The Case of Norway.

Ellis, Stephen. "How to Rebuild Africa." *Foreign Affairs* 84.5 (2005): 135-48. Print.

Epstein, D. L., Bates, R., Goldstone, J., Kristensen, I., & O'Halloran, S. (2006). Democratic transitions. *American journal of political science*, *50*(3), 551-569.

Fearon, J. D., & Laitin, D. D. (2003). Ethnicity, insurgency, and civil war. *American political science review*, *97*(01), 75-90.

Feng, Y. (1997). Democracy, political stability and economic growth. *British Journal of Political Science*, *27*(03), 391-418.

Fessha, Y, & Nam, N. H. T.. (2015). Is it time to let go? The best loser system in Mauritius. *Afrika Focus*, 28(1), 63-79.

Fomunyoh, Christopher. "Democratization in Fits and Starts." *Journal of Democracy* 12.3 (2001): 37-50. Print.

FreedomHouse.org. "Mauritius." *Freedom House*. Web. 11 May 2012. <http://www.freedomhouse.org/country/mauritius>.

Galston, W. A. (2001). Political knowledge, political engagement, and civic education. *Annual review of political science*, *4*(1), 217-234.

Gerring, John, Peter Kingstone, Matthew Lange, and Aseema Sinha. "Democracy, History, and Economic Performance: A Case-Study Approach." *World Development* 39.10 (2011): 1735-748. Print.

Gerring, J., & Zarecki, D. (2011). Size and democracy revisited. DISC Working Papers.

Giroux, H. A. (1992). Literacy, pedagogy, and the politics of difference. *College Literature*, *19*(1), 1-11.

Gray, Christopher J. "Cultivating Citizenship through Xenophobia in Gabon, 1960-1995." *Africa Today* 45.3-4 (1998): 389-410. Print.

Haggard, Stephan, Andrew MacIntyre, and Lydia Tiede. "The Rule of Law and Economic Development." *Annual Review of Political Science* 11.1 (2008): 205-34. Print.

Haggard, S., & Kaufman, R. R. (1995). *The political economy of democratic transitions*. Princeton University Press.

Huber, E., Rueschemeyer, D., & Stephens, J. D. (1993). The Impact of Economic Development on Democracy. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 7*(3), 71-86. Retrieved January 29, 2016.

Huber, E., Rueschemeyer, D., & Stephens, J. D. (1997). The paradoxes of contemporary democracy: formal, participatory, and social dimensions. *Comparative Politics*, 323-342.

Huntington, S. P. (1968). *Political order in changing societies*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Jacobs, L. R., Cook, F. L., & Carpini, M. X. D. (2009, August 1). *Talking together: Public deliberation and political participation in America*. University of Chicago Press.

Karkani, Aneel. "Microfinance Misses Its Mark." *Stanford Social Innovation Review* 5.3 (2007): 34-40. Print.

Kasenally, Roukaya. "Mauritius; Paradise Reconsidered." *Journal of Democracy* 22.2 (2011): 160-69. Print.

Lange, M. "Embedding the Colonial State: A Comparative-Historical Analysis of State Building and Broad-Based Development in Mauritius." *Social Science History* 27.3 (2003): 397-423. Print.

Lewis, Peter. "Growth Without Prosperity in Africa." *Journal of Democracy* 19.4 (2008): 95-109. Print.

Li, H., & Zou, H. (1998). Income inequality is not harmful for growth: theory and evidence. *Review of development economics*, *2*(3), 318-334.

Li, Q., & Reuveny, R. (2003). Economic globalization and democracy: An empirical analysis. *British Journal of Political Science*, *33*(01), 29-54.

Lipset, S. M. (1959). Democracy and Working-Class Authoritarianism. *American Sociological Review, 24*(4), 482-504. Retrieved January 29, 2016, from http://www.jstor.org.www2.lib.ku.edu/stable/2089536

Lipset, S. M. (1959). Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy. *Am Polit Sci Rev American Political Science Review, 53*(01), 69-105. Retrieved January 29, 2016.

Lummis, C. D. (1991). Development against Democracy. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political, 16*(1), 31-66. Retrieved January 29, 2016.

Maoz, Z., & Russett, B. (1992). Alliance, contiguity, wealth, and political stability: Is the lack of conflict among democracies a statistical artifact? 1. *International Interactions*, *17*(3), 245-267.

Mihailidis, P., & Cohen, J. (2013). Exploring curation as a core competency in digital and media literacy education. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education*, *2013*(1).

Milanovic, B. (2005). The Modern World: The effect of democracy, colonialism and war on economic growth 1820-2000. *Colonialism and War on Economic Growth*, *2000*.

Moss, T., Pettersson, G., & Van de Walle, N. (2006). An aid-institutions paradox. *A review essay on aid dependency and state building in Sub-Saharan Africa, Washington, DC: Center for Global Development (CGD Working Paper 74/2006)*.

Mueller, D. C., & Stratmann, T. (2003). The economic effects of democratic participation. *Journal of Public Economics*, *87*(9), 2129-2155.

Muller, E. N. (1995). Economic determinants of democracy. *American Sociological Review*, 966-982.

Nunn, N. (2007). Historical legacies: A model linking Africa's past to its current underdevelopment. *Journal of development economics*, *83*(1), 157-175.

Olsson, O. (2009). On the democratic legacy of colonialism. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, *37*(4), 534-551.

Paley, J. (2002). Toward an anthropology of democracy. *Annual review of anthropology*, 469-496.

Pierson, P., & Skocpol, T. (2002). Historical institutionalism in contemporary political science. *Political science: The state of the discipline*, *3*, 693-721.

Przeworski, A., & Limongi, F. (1997). Modernization: Theories and facts. *World politics*, *49*(02), 155-183.

Reilly, B. (2000). Democracy, ethnic fragmentation, and internal conflict: Confused theories, faulty data, and the "Crucial Case" of Papua New Guinea.

The Republic of Mauritius. "Education Statistics, 2011." *The Republic of Mauritius*. Web. 29 Apr. 2012. <http://www.gov.mu/portal/goc/cso/ei921/educate.pdf>.

Republic of Mauritius. "The Republic of Mauritius." *Government of Mauritius*. NCB. Web. 29 Apr. 2012. <http://www.gov.mu/portal/site/abtmtius/menuitem.163fea3f13ca22984d57241079b521ca/>.

Reuters. "TIMELINE: Gabon and Omar Bongo." *Reuters*. Reuters, 8 June 2009. Web. 10 May 2012. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2009/06/08/us-gabon-timeline-sb-idUSTRE55744Y20090608>.

Rich, Jeremy. "Hunger and Consumer Protest in Colonial Africa During the First World War: The Case of the Gabon Estuary, 1914–1920." *Food, Culture and Society: An International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research* 10.2 (2007): 239-59. Print.

Rich, Jeremy. ""Leopard Men", Slaves and Social Conflict in Libreville (Gabon), C. 1860-1879." *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 34.3 (2001): 619-38. Print.

Rich, Jeremy. ""White Coronations and Magical Boycotts": Omyene Political Strategies, Clan Leaders and French Rule in Coastal Gabon, 1870-1920." *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 43.2 (2010): 207-26. Print.

Rosenberg, Tina. "A Payoff Out of Poverty?" *The New York Times*. The New York Times, 19 Dec. 2008. Web. 11 May 2012. <https://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/21/magazine/21cash-t.html?_r=2>.

Rothstein, Bo, and Jan Teorell. "What Is Quality of Government? A Theory of Impartial Government Institutions." *Governance* 21.2 (2008): 165-90. Print.

Roxas, Sixto K., and Gerardo R. Ungson. "From Alleviation to Eradication: A Reassessment of Modernization, Market-Based, and Communitarian Solutions to Global Poverty." *Poverty & Public Policy* 3.2 (2011). Print.

Rueschemeyer, D., Stephens, E. H., & Stephens, J. D. (1992). Capitalist development and democracy. *Cambridge, UK*.

Rustow, Dankwart A. "Transitions to Democracy: Toward a Dynamic Model." *Comparative Politics* 2.3 (1970): 337-63. Print.

Sachs, Jeffrey D. "The Development Challenge." *Foreign Affairs* 84.2 (2005): 78-89. Print.

Saez, Lawrence, and Julia Gallagher. "Authoritarianism and Development in the Third World." *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* 15.2 (2009): 87-101. Print.

Sen, A. K. (1999). Democracy as a universal value. *Journal of democracy*, *10*(3), 3-17.

Shin, D. (2012). Is Democracy Emerging as a Universal Value? A Contrarian Perspective. Asia Barometer Survey Working Paper.

Soto, Hernando De. *The Mystery of Capital: Why Capitalism Triumphs in the West and Fails Everywhere Else*. New York: Basic, 2000. Print.

Srebrnik, Henry. "'Full of Sound and Fury': Three Decades of Parliamentary Politics in Mauritius." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 28.2 (2002): 277-89. Print.

Srebrnik, H. (2004). Small island nations and democratic values. *World Development*, *32*(2), 329-341.

UNICEF. "At a Glance: Mauritius." *UNICEF*. Web. 11 May 2012. <http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/mauritius.html>.

UNICEF. "Gabon." *UNICEF*. Web. 11 May 2012. <http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/gabon_statistics.html>.

United Nations Development Programme. "International Human Development Indicators - United Nations Development Programme." *International Human Development Indicators*. Web. 11 May 2012. <http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/indicators/103106.html>.

Waller, Gary M., and Warner Woodworth. "Microcredit as a Grass-Roots Policy for International Development." *Policy Studies Journal* 29.2 (2001): 267-82. Print.

Williams, P. J. (2009). Technological literacy: a multliteracies approach for democracy. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, *19*(3), 237-254.